



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## DISCUSSION.

## A FURTHER REJOINDER TO PROFESSOR RITCHIE.

[NOTE.—The following abbreviated communication from Mr. John M. Robertson closes the discussion that has been going on between him and Professor Ritchie since the latter's article on "War and Peace" in the January number, 1901.—MANAGING EDITOR.]

In his "Further Reply" to me in the October number, Professor Ritchie asserts that I reiterated a certain charge against his dialectic method "without being able to cite a single sentence" of his in support of my statement. . . . My original statement was to the effect that he had repeatedly adopted a chronological measure of personal authority in regard to the very question under discussion. I now give the proofs. In a letter by Mr. Ritchie in the *Ethical World* of February 17, 1900, page 110, occurs this sentence: "From people who have lived longer than three months in Africa, I have heard very different evidence from that collected by Mr. Hobson." . . . In a subsequent letter to the *Ethical World* (March 3, 1900, page 142), Mr. Ritchie has this sentence: "I am not prepared implicitly to accept all the testimony either of missionaries who have spent their lives among the natives, or of journalists who have been three months in the country." . . . . He repeats gratuitously his insinuation that Mr. Hobson's views on South Africa were properly to be discredited because he has been only three months there. All the while Prof. Ritchie did not claim to have been there at all. It may seem as if, that being so, he cannot have meant what he seemed to say, since it would imply that his judgment on the subject was worth nothing. . . . . Mr. Hobson never professed to stake his argument on his own first hand testimony, any more than Mr. Ritchie did.

Mr. Ritchie has convicted me of one inaccuracy, and I offer my apologies. . . . . I desire to avow my regret that I caused him to explain that he is a professor not of moral philosophy (as I erroneously stated) but solely of logic, in the same page with his pretence that I committed a fallacy of Division in citing the names of some of the best known members of what he called "a small but very blatant faction." . . . . Another illustration may serve better than any analysis to illustrate his mental process.

When he reviewed Mr. Hobson's book he spoke of it as Mr. Hobson's "case against his country." Thus when Mr. Hobson impeaches the policy of Mr. Ritchie's party, Mr. Ritchie, a Professor of Logic, holds himself free to call the book an impeachment of the nation. But when I cite the names of a number of the leading men in what Mr. Ritchie calls a "small but very blatant faction," I am guilty of the fallacy of division!

If Mr. Ritchie had been candid enough to admit that he ought not to have used the expression he did, instead of taking the course under notice . . . . he would have made, I think, a better finish to our discussion. I shall not imitate him by pleading that the chair of Moral Philosophy used often to be joined with that of Logic in Scotch Universities, and that I thought it was so at St. Andrews'.

JOHN M. ROBERTSON.

LONDON, ENGLAND.

---

### BOOK REVIEWS.

**THE PROBLEM OF CONDUCT: A STUDY IN THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF ETHICS.** By A. E. Taylor, Assistant Lecturer in Greek and Philosophy at the Owens College, Manchester; Late Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co. Pp. viii., 501.

The author was well advised in publishing this Essay, which was awarded the Green Moral Philosophy Prize in 1899; and is to be congratulated on having produced a very readable and a well written volume. One may perhaps reasonably object to the length of the book, when one discovers that the argument is needlessly repeated and amplified; but no one will be able to regard even the digressions as dull reading. The author modestly but (excepting as regards the chapter on the "Roots of Ethics") honestly disclaims any credit for originality in the principles from which his argument proceeds. All that he has to say will, he tells us, be found to be contained in or derived from Mr. Bradley's discussions in the "Ethical Studies" and "Appearance and Reality." And indeed any one acquainted with these books will be surprised to find how familiar Mr. Taylor's statements sound. But in spite of this debt to Mr. Bradley, one feels that Mr. Taylor's arguments do not come from a mere echo, but from the in-